



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO).	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,718	•	02/09/2004	Christina Cacioppo	2003-0029 (1014-058)	9558
26652	7590	07/27/2005		EXAMINER	
AT&T C	ORP.		WOO, STELLA L		
	P.O. BOX 4110 MIDDLETOWN, NJ 07748			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WIDDLETOWN, NJ 07746				2643	
				DATE MAILED: 07/27/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Commence	10/774,718	CACIOPPO ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Stella L. Woo	2643					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133)					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>.</u>						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.	•					
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 February 2004</u> is/are	: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected	to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the d		` '					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction		, , ,					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da	(PTO-413)					
2) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		te atent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 10/774,718

Art Unit: 2643

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 6-12, 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loomis et al. (US 5,625,668, hereinafter "Loomis") in view of Kepler (US 6,748,225).

Regarding claims 1, 19 and 20, Loomis discloses a method comprising:

receiving from a user-operated telecommunications device a user-initiated communication to a non-911 communications address (user of cellular telephone 12 dials a special access non-emergency telephone number; col. 3, lines 55-57);

automatically providing a user with a spoken current location of a user-associated telecommunications device (a speech synthesizer 94 provides the user with a spoken street address or cross-street location of the user's cellular telephone 12; col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 6).

Loomis differs from claims 1, 19, and 20 in that it does not teach requesting from the user verification of the current location. However, Kepler, from the same field of endeavor, teaches the desirability of requesting from a wireless telephone user confirmation that the user is in the location identified by the system by asking if the user sees an expected landmark proximate to the current location (col. 7, lines 1-13; Figure 5). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such user verification, as taught by Kepler, within the method of Loomis in order to ensure that a correct current location is provided to the user.

Application/Control Number: 10/774,718

Art Unit: 2643

Regarding claims 6-8 and 10, in Loomis, the database processing facility 22 receives the latitude, longitude and bearing information of the cellular telephone 12 via GPS receiver 14, cellular telephone transceiver 16 and cellular station 20 (col. 2, lines 1-48, Figure 1), which provide ALI service to "911" facility 24 (col. 2, lines 39-59).

Regarding claim 9, in Loomis, location information can be determined by triangulation (col. 6, lines 17-27).

Regarding claim 11, in Loomis, data processing facility 22 provides location information to a "911" facility 24 (col. 2, lines 39-59).

Regarding claim 12, Kepler teaches that a wireless telephone user can access the system using voice over Internet (col. 4, lines 34-37).

Regarding claims 14-15, 17, in Loomis, the user-operated device and the user-associated device are the same (cellular telephone 12; col. 3, line 55 – col. 4, line 6).

Regarding claim 16, in Loomis, the spoken current location is provided by speech synthesizer 94 after having been converted from text (col. 4, lines 16-27).

Regarding claim 18, in Kepler, the traveling user can access the system via PSTN 12 (Figure 1; col. 4, lines 28-32).

3. Claims 2-5, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Loomis and Kepler, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chern et al. (US 6,456,854, hereinafter "Chern").

The combination of Loomis and Kepler differs from claims 2-5 in that it does not specify receiving a communications address, receiving at an Internet site or recording a communications address. However, Chern, from the same field of endeavor, teaches the desirability of

requesting the location of a mobile telephone from a Web site in which a requesting user enters the unique identifier of the specific mobile telephone device whose location is desired (col. 7, lines 5-20). Chern further teaches recording the current location of the associated mobile telephone at a Web server via recorder 268 (col. 6, lines 29-39; col. 8, lines 21-25). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such location tracking over the Internet, as taught by Chern, within the method of Loomis and Kepler as additional use of a mobile telephone's current location.

Regarding claim 13, Chern teaches the user manually sending current location information to the Web server (col. 6, lines 11-34) such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to have the user send current location data to a provided communications address (Web server address), as taught by Chern, within the method of Loomis and Kepler in order to provide the most current location data.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hanson, Peterson et al., Bruce et al., and Smethers show other systems which provide the location of a wireless device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stella L. Woo whose telephone number is (571) 272-7512. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday, Thursday-Friday.

Art Unit: 2643

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stella L. Woo Primary Examiner Art Unit 2643
